

Date: Mon, 29 Nov 93 04:30:15 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #495
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 29 Nov 93 Volume 93 : Issue 495

Today's Topics:

 .edu vs .org (was: No Code etc...)
 Club by-laws and documents
 morse code
 No Code etc...
One view of licensing requirements (USA)
 Thanx, no-coders!
 This is a hobby not a
 Use of HT for Marine & GMRS
 Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 25 Nov 93 20:52:33 CST
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!
menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: .edu vs .org (was: No Code etc...)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

> In article <2d13bk\$sf1@charm.magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu> wvhorn@magnus.acs.ohi
> >In article <TJgHdc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Picke
> >
> >
> > you no-.edu hams.
> > establishment of the no-.edu license.

The documents can be emailed (via internet), faxed, snail-mailed in any form possible. I will reimburse reasonable first class U.S. postage if so requested (fax and mail charges are your burden).

Your help will certainly be appreciated by the members of the North Alabama Repeater Association!

=====
D. Alan Cunningham, Principal Engineer, NASA Spacelink Project
Boeing Computer Support Services at NASA/MSFC Phone:205-544-3091
Email: alan.cunningham%ccmail@x400gw.msfc.nasa.gov Fax:205-544-2362
Snail Mail: 130 Roy Drive, Madison, AL 35758
NASA Spacelink Modems:205-895-0028 Internet:spacelink.msfc.nasa.gov

Date: 29 Nov 93 00:04:00 GMT
From: mulvey!rich@uunet.uu.net
Subject: morse code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Sysop of WAENA (jw@waena.edu) wrote:

: Hello future fellow hams,
: I am studying for my FCC license. I have learned morse code
: from an old Navy manual. Unfortunately, it did not include
: many codes, only a-z & 0-9. Can someone please email me a
: simple text file that shows all the morse code 'characters'?
: I have looked in a number of bookstores and found none. I
: think I saw one at Radio Shack, but I can't afford \$15,
: especially for just for a single page of text.

: Thanks in advance, jw

Well, first off, you're learning the code in exactly the WRONG way. Memorizing the code "visually" is guaranteed to cause havoc when you try to increase your speed beyond a few words-per-minute. Why? Because when you memorize "dot-dash" instead of associating the sound "didah" with the letter 'A', you introduce an extra level of translation that takes a lot longer to resolve. Don't even bother trying to memorize the code that way. Instead, take a trip down to your local library and find some code-practice tapes - I used "Morse Code - the Essential Language" when I was learning. If they don't have it, ask them to get it via Inter-Library Loan.

Along with that, if you have access to a PC, there are a number of good programs available that make learning Morse even easier. E-mail me

— —

Rich Mulvey
rich@mulvey.com

Amateur Radio: N2VDS
"QRP is not for sissies"

Rochester, NY

Date: Thu, 25 Nov 93 20:40:32 CST
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!
unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Code etc...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

> First you complain about my comprehension, then, in the same paragraph,
> you proceed to AGAIN compare Class D CB to Japan's No-CODE HF. In one
> paragraph you say you are not doing it, then you say it again.

Let's shoot a little closer to home, Dan. *I'm* comparing Class D CB to Two Meters. In fact, the only difference between the two is that, for the most part, the CBers of Two Meters identify with their assigned amateur call sign.

While we're comparing CBers to Amateurs, here's something else for you to consider: the difference between US and THEM is the fact that WE passed Morse code examinations, whereas the CBer did not.

Checkmate.

- -Robert

The
Codeless
Technician's
Winter
Home

Please note
antennas
for both
Citizen's Band
and Two Meters

Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1993 01:56:51 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-

state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!news.eecs.nwu.edu!ahab.eecs.nwu.edu!
hpa@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: One view of licensing requirements (USA)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

This applies to the USA only, hence the distribution.

First of all, my position: I am a Technician, with code; I was licensed before no-code Tech existed.

I got my license while a junior in High School. In my opinion, there is a vast discrepancy between the Morse skill levels and the theory skill levels required. When I took my license exam, I could only pass Morse code up to NT level (5 WPM) while, *without any form of preparation*, I passed theory tests up to and including Advanced and failed Extra by one question.

Four years later I am still unable to do Morse code at 13 WPM and hence my interest in Amateur Radio has, sadly, started to dissipate.

I do think that Morse code is significant, but at this point it is the main barrier for upgrading, which I do not think it should be. I also think that the level of the theory pools is way too low. In my opinion, it is not acceptable to pass the Advanced level theory without being able to construct a simple CW HF transmitter. For Extra class, you should be able to at least construct a receiver and/or transmitter for a more involved modulation type, such as FM or FSK, and know enough digital technology to construct a working radio modem.

On the other hand, I would personally like to see Morse requirements reduced to a level where they can be justified more than as an entrance barrier. For example 9 WPM for General and 13 WPM for Extra. Combined with beefed-up question pools, it will strike a balance more appropriate to the current level of technology, and maybe bring more electronics interested people into ham radio. In particular I would personally like to see people who actually know how to build radios, and related equipment. Who knows, it might even boost the popularity of CW, because the first thing that anyone is going to try with their radio transmitter under development is certainly not going to be FM!!!!

/hpa

--

INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu FINGER/TALK: hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu
IBM MAIL: I0050052 at IBMMAIL NeXTMAIL: hpa@speedy.acns.nwu.edu
FIDONET: 1:115/511 or 1:115/989.4 HAM RADIO: N9ITP or SM4TKN
The Northwestern University Fidonet/Internet Gatekeeper.

Date: Sun, 28 Nov 1993 23:54:37 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!news.uiowa.edu!icaen!drenze@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Thanx, no-coders!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well, my \$0.02 toward the code/no-code debate...

While I was out of town on Friday, I was rear-ended and my car
smashed up rather nastily. I made a call on my 2-meter HT requesting
emergency assistance (no autopatch on the repeater I was monitoring)
and it was a no-code tech that came back to me. He handled the emergency
traffic, contacted the necessary authorities, and monitored the frequency
until the authorities were there.

Even if I already weren't a believer in the no-code license,
I would be now, because that tech wasn't the only person on the repeater at
at the time. There were some people sporting advanced and extra calls who
clammed up as soon as I came across with a request for emergency assistance--
I guess I wasn't welcome on the repeater 'cause I wasn't one of the "good
ol' boys."

73, Doug

--
__ /| | Doug Renze, N0YVW |
\ 'o.o' | +1 319 337 4664 | If you can read this you're too close.
=(___)= | drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu |
U | Douglas-Renze@uiowa.edu |

Date: Sat, 27 Nov 93 18:31:09 EST
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!
mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: This is a hobby not a
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

```
> In article <1993Nov24.192018.10920@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.  
> >  
> (from dan@mystis.wariat.org)  
> >> But since you brought it up, what have coded hams done  
> >>in the 10 years before that.  
> >  
> >Packet radio, to name the most prominent. Next?  
>
```

> You'd have to reach back about 6 more years, and to Canada, to make
> that claim. And the DXer mentality of many coded hams created a
> disaster of contending and competing network fragments that were
> firmly wedded to an obsolete hardware base. New techs are at the
> forefront of pushing us up the technological curve, and most importantly,
> to achieving organizational structures that *work*. The number of
> MIS and networking types who've gotten Tech licenses around here is
> amazing. Locally we've gone from two network systems literate hams to
> dozens in the past two years, all because of the removal of the code
> test from Tech. We've also picked up satellite and microwave engineers
> as new Techs. *They're* busy building hardware, including what promises
> to be a really nifty GPS aided RDF system.

When I got my Tech license (issued July 1991, just after the code test
free license) I was SHOCKED to see that the mainstay computer in packet
was the commodore 64. I have one, collecting dusting my basement for
years. It is still there, waiting for me to decide to get into packet.
(I do it as a living, I wanted to explore other amateur radio facets
frist.) Now it seems that the Tech's around here are pushing people into
the real world of IBM. Even the NON-computer-networking type Tech's.

>
> >>And as far as furthering the OTHER purposes of the Amateur Radio
> >>Service, I could site hundreds of examples. Not the LEAST of which is
> >>greater intrest in ham radio by young people. And the great influx of
> >>hams to give us a louder voice with the FCC and governement in general.
> >>There are many, many more.
> >
> >Not to mention the influx of the lawless, and those too damned lazy to earn
> >privileges instead of working for them.
>
> Heh. The goal is to work smarter, not harder, and the lawless were already
> here, populating 14.313 and most of 75 meters. None of those code test
> free licensees have contributed to those messes. And most of the new Techs
> have joined, and in many cases revitalized and pushed forward, existing
> amateur groups. They have an almost unbelievable level of excitment and
> energy that they've brought to us.
>
> >The code-free license was a mistake from which ham radio may well never
> >recover.
>
> The code test free license was the one bright spot in a regulatory
> environment that went to hell in 1968 and hasn't fully recovered yet.
> Amateur radio was dying, with the average age of amateurs at 54 and
> creeping up almost a year for every year that passed. We were in
> desperate need of new, and younger, blood. The ARRL's recruitment
> of seniors to a permanent Novice with voice priviledges license
> didn't work, but the code test free Tech license has given us that

> new blood. Our growth rate has almost returned to that of the 1950s.
> And with that growth has come a vitality and excitement about amateur
> radio that's been sadly lacking among the old guard whose hardened
> arteries weren't letting enough blood in to prevent senility for
> the service.
>
> After three years, I'm even more excited about the code test free
> license than I was in the beginning. Now I'm seeing the fruits of
> that hard work, and it's sweet.
>
> Gary

As usual Gary, we agree. (And well said.)

Interesting how Tech has replaced Novice as THE entry level license class. And around here at least, most Tech's are working on upgrading. And I for one am glad to help any way I can. (Including my MCW net on 2-Meters.)

```
=====
|| Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV    || 'Pots have handles, Magazines have ||
|| dan@mystis.wariat.org    ||      Personals, Hams have Names'    ||
=====
|| 'Your enemy is never a villian in his own eyes. Keep this in ||
|| mind; it may offer a way to make him your friend. If not you ||
|| can kill him without hate - and quickly.' -Lazarus Long      ||
=====
```

Date: 27 Nov 1993 17:44:54 GMT
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Use of HT for Marine & GMRS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Bennett Kobb (bkobb@netcom.com) wrote:

: Basic, not full-featured, GMRS handhelds are available for much less
: money than that via mail order. I recommend contacting the Personal Radio
: Steering Group for info on the various types of equipment available (PRSG
: BBS 313 995 2100).

Two sources of El Cheapo GMRS gear:

Uniden GMR100 \$169.95
from
Communications Electronics Inc
1-800-USA-SCAN
ad on page 161, December QST

Maxon GMRS-21 \$109.90
from
National Tower Co.
1-800-762-5049
ad on page 140, December QST

These units are both basic radios, no CTCSS, etc.

Bob Witte / HP PMO (Colo Springs) / bobw@col.hp.com / KB0CY / (719) 590-3230

Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1993 00:03:00 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!news.uiowa.edu!icaen!drenze@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Why isn't Amateur Radio like CB?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dpt@ri.cadre.com (Dan P. Trainor) writes:

>As far as i'm concerned, these bands are gone forever!

They're only gone forever if we give up on them. You want to keep the standards of amateur radio high? Then get on 2-meters, show the newbies how to act. Invite them to a club meeting. Maybe have the presentation (or whatever) be something on VHF operation.

Think of them as you would children. The first time you hear a little kid use a four-letter word or be rude to an adult, do you say to yourself, "Well! If Johnny's acting like this at age 2, what's he going to be like when he's 12?" and just give up on him? Why not give no-coders the same benefit of the doubt?

Just my \$0.02 on the debate.

73, Doug

--
__ /| | Doug Renze, N0YVW |
\ 'o.O' | +1 319 337 4664 | If you can read this you're too close.
=(__)= | drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu |
U | Douglas-Renze@uiowa.edu |

Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1993 20:45:30 GMT
From: unix.sri.com!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@hplabs.hp.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rcrw90-171193132142@node_13059.aieg.mot.com>,
<1993Nov18.002719.24286@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Nov21.153429.18048@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Strawman. What Mike is saying is that "necessity is the mother of
>invention". When the voice mode crowding became unbearable in the
>1950s, amateurs converted to a superior technical solution, SSB.

The switch from AM to SSB brought us about 2x closer to the Shannon Bound.
Currently, nothing is as close to the Bound as SSB for voice, certainly not
2x better.

You don't hack off your foot in the hopes of evolving a better one.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

Date: Sun, 28 Nov 1993 21:19:25 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!utnut!torn!nott!cunews!freenet.carleton.ca!
Freenet.carleton.ca!aj467@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov25.003553.4694@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<2d0k98INNbeu@emx.cc.utexas.edu>, <C
Reply-To : aj467@Freenet.carleton.ca (Bill Macpherson)
Subject : Re: Japanese no-code on HF

In a previous article, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) says:

>In article <CH16n6.6JB@freenet.carleton.ca> aj467@Freenet.carleton.ca (Bill
Macpherson) writes:

>>Sometimes higher power signals travel farther into the ionosphere before
>>being deflected, causing higher power signals to have lower apparent
>>signal strength in light of absorption.

>

>Oooh, tell us how this works Mr. Heaviside. :-)

Well Gary, I see the smiley, but, do you agree, or not agree.

--

Bill VE3NJW Advanced Amateur
Packet Address : VE3NJW@VE3KYT.#EON.ON.CAN
Freenet Address: aj467@Freenet.Carleton.ca

Date: 29 Nov 1993 02:54:39 GMT
From: nothing.ucsd.edu!brian@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov24.192018.10920@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<RZeIDc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, <1993Nov26.201238.27920@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Subject : Re: This is a hobby not a

In article <1993Nov26.201238.27920@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>Some substantiation of this would be nice. From a personal and anecdotal
>experience, everyone I know of who's doing R&D work in this field has
>at least an Advanced, and most have an Extra.

Not all of us, Paul.

Not by a long shot.
- Brian

Date: Sun, 28 Nov 1993 22:24:39 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov23.100605.28773@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<1993Nov23.231751.14081@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Nov28.161559.21452@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements

In article <1993Nov28.161559.21452@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

```
>
>Now on the issue of Morse users being retrotechnology, I'd be a bit
>more careful and say only that it should be self-evident that the
>time they spend on Morse activities takes away from time they could
>
>      ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>be spending on more technically advanced modes. But I wouldn't contend
>that if they were not doing Morse that they would actually be doing
>more technically advanced things. They've already made that choice
>clear.
```

>

For 'Morse activities' we can substitute SSB or FM or TTY or ATV or USENET.

Jeff NH6IL

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #495
